

REMARKS

Claims rejections under 35 USC 112

The Applicant notes the 35 USC 112 objections in the office action. Accordingly the applicant has made a 112 statement at the beginning of this response which should address these 112 objections, namely : that the combination of this application, along with Reeves US 6,467, 690 and Reeves 09/ 578.664 (now US 7,295,988) which are incorporate by reference herein, can be understood and built by a person skilled in the art.

Claims rejections under 35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 58-62, 64, 66, 68-71, 73-74, , 76-77 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yeager WO 97/22297.

Independent Claims 58 and 68

As previously stated herein the applicant has modified independent claims 58 and 68 to more clearly define the art of the application herein. Specifically the, applicant has added the phrase "that operate by means of an external power source" to both the preamble of independent claims 58 and 68. Also, the second and fifth elements of claim 58 have been modified to more clearly define and clarify the art herein, specifically the second element has been modified to add language regarding an external power source and the fifth element has been modified to more clearly describe the capacitance and inductance pads. Also, the second and fourth elements of claim 68 have been modified to more clearly define and clarify the art herein, specifically the second element has been modified to add the language about the external power source and the fourth element has been modified to more clearly define the capacitance and inductance pads.

The applicant respectfully submits that these claims modifications differentiate the art herein from Yeager WO 97/22297.

Independent Claims 58 and 68 are being rejected under 35 USC 102 e as being anticipated by Yeager WO 97/22297. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments to claims 58 and 68 address the 35 USC 102 rejections and Yeager does not teach each and every element of amended claims 58 and 68. Therefore, the rejection of claims 58 and 68 under 35 USC 102 should be withdrawn.

Claims 59, 60, 61, 62, and 66 depend from claim 58. Therefore, the reasons set forth above distinguishing claim 58 apply equally here and are incorporated herein. Thus, for at least the above identified reasons Yeager does not teach each and every element of claims 59, 60, 61, 62, and 66 to support an anticipation rejection under 35 USC 102. Therefore, the rejection of claims 59, 60, 61, 62, and 66 under 35 USC 102 as being unpatentable over Yeager should be withdrawn.

Claims 69, 70, 71, 73-74, and 76-77 depend from claim 68. Therefore, the reasons set forth above distinguishing claim 68 apply equally here and are incorporated herein. Thus, for at least the above identified reasons Yeager does not teach each and every element of claims 69, 70, 71, 73-74, and 76-77 to support an anticipation rejection under 35 USC 102. Therefore, the rejection of claims 69, 70, 71, 73-74, and 76-77 under 35 USC 102 as being unpatentable over Yeager should be withdrawn.

Claims rejections under 35 USC 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 58-62, 64, and 66, 68-71, 73-74, and 76-77 as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of Linder. As previously stated the Applicant has amended independent claims 58 and 68 herein to further distinguish the art herein from the prior art noted in the Office Action. Specifically the, applicant has added the phrase “that operate by means of an external power source” to both the preamble of independent claims 58 and 68. Also, the second and fifth elements of claim 58 have been modified to more clearly define and clarify the art herein, specifically the second element has been modified to add language regarding an external power source and the fifth element has been modified to more clearly describe the capacitance and inductance pads. Also, the second and fourth elements of claim 68 have been modified to more clearly define and clarify the art herein, specifically the second element has been modified to add the language about the external power source and the fourth element has been modified to more clearly define the capacitance and inductance pads. The applicant respectfully submits that these claims modifications differentiate the art herein from Yeager in view of Linder.

Independent Claims 58 and 68

Claims 58 and 68 are being rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Yeager, in view of Linder. The Applicant has amended these claims herein to further distinguish his art from the prior art. For at least the above reasons the combined prior art of Yeager in view of Linder does not teach each and every element of claims 58 and 68 to support and obviousness rejection under 35 USC 103. In addition, there is nothing within either Yeager or Linder that suggests they would be motivated to teach the art

within this application and there is no suggestion of an expectation of success by Yeager and Linder. Therefore, the rejection of claims 58 and 68 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Yeager in view of Linder should be withdrawn

Claims 63, 65, and 67 depend from claim 58. Therefore, the reasons set forth above distinguishing claim 58 apply equally here and are incorporated herein. Thus, for at least the above identified reasons Yeager in light of Linder does not teach each and every element of claims 63, 65, and 67 to support an obviousness rejection under 35 USC 103. Therefore, the rejection of claims 63, 65, and 67 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Yeager, in view of Linder should be withdrawn.

Claim 72 depends from claim 68. Therefore, the reasons set forth above distinguishing claim 68 apply equally here and are incorporated herein. Thus, for at least the above identified reasons Yeager in light of Linder does not teach each and every element of the process claim 72 to support an obviousness rejection under 35 USC 103. Therefore, the rejection of claim 72 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Yeager, in view of Linder should be withdrawn.

The applicant respectfully submits that all 112, 102, and 103 rejections to the claims have been addressed by virtue of these amended claims. The applicant respectfully requests that the examiner allow amended claims 58-77 as presented herein.

The applicant respectfully submits that a petition for expedited examination for this application was granted in 2004, and the applicant respectfully requests an expedited examination of this response.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William Reeves', is written over a horizontal line.

William Reeves, Inventor-Applicant